

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated April 3, 2008 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-15 remain pending. Claim 10 has been amended to become an independent claim. Consequently the current independent claims are 1, 10 and 14. Reconsideration of the above identified mislabeling examination has questioned confirmation of the fact that previously, claim 1 had been designated as amended, yet contained no indication as where and/or what had been amended. Applicants regret this error. Previously, claim 1 had not been amended from its originally filed form. With the current amendment, claim 1 stands "currently amended" and is properly designated as such.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-15 are objected to because of various informalities. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, Applicants have deleted parenthetical reference characters previously contained in the claims. With this amendment, Applicants believe that the reason for the Examiner's objection to these

allowance. The remaining claims have not been so rewritten because, for the reasons given below, their base claim, as amended, is believed to be allowable.

Claims 1-3, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Dawson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,229,506.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses, the Examiner's reason for rejecting these claims.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. An active matrix display device comprising an array of display pixels, each pixel comprising:
  - a current driven light emitting display element and a first drive transistor for driving a current through the display element, the display element and the first drive transistor being in series between power supply lines;